



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the individuals who require permanent supervision or institutional care. *Mental growth and the I. Q.*: LEWIS M. TERMAN (325-341).—The work of Dr. Doll is examined. "His own conclusions are so often either contrary to his facts or else irrelevant to them that verification is always necessary." The article is continued in the October issue. *Department for Discussion of Research Problems. Notes on Articles in Educational Psychology in Current issues of other Magazines. Special Review of Mrs. Burgess's Monograph on Silent Reading. New Publications in Educational Psychology and Related Fields of Education.*

Root, William T., Jr. A Socio-Psychological Study of Fifty-three Supernormal Children. (Psychological Monographs, Vol. XXIX, No. 4.) Princeton, N. J.: Psychological Review Co. 1921. Pp. 134.

Spiller, G. A New System of Scientific Procedure: Being an Attempt to Ascertain, Develop, and Systematise the General Methods Employed in Modern Enquiries at Their Best. London: Watts & Co. 1921. Pp. 441.

NOTES AND NEWS

To the Members of the American Philosophical Association, Eastern Division:

At its Annual Meeting, December 30, 1921, the American Philosophical Association (Eastern Division) appropriated a considerable part of its available funds for literary aid to European universities and scholars. The vote on the resolution was unanimous. The great need for books and journals on the part of foreign scholars impoverished by the war and its consequences impressed the Association when it was brought to the attention of the Meeting. From the editors among its membership it learned also of the many requests from abroad for gifts of current journals—requests which the several reviews have often met, but which as a whole their resources do not allow them to satisfy. Finally, it was felt that this was a form of international coöperation which all could approve.

The Association appropriated two hundred dollars—one third of its balance—for this purpose. In the discussion of the motion, the hope was also expressed that additional gifts of money or books might be received from individuals. The management of the fund was entrusted to the Committee on International Coöperation, which met immediately and appointed Professors Woodbridge and Cohen a sub-committee to take direct charge of the work. Arrangements

have now been perfected for the forwarding and distribution, without cost, of whatever we may be able to give. It is very desirable that any of our members who feel able to contribute, or to spare books or journals from their libraries, should communicate with the sub-committee so soon as may be convenient. In particular, it is desired to collect works representative of the more recent phases of American thought. In case of doubt, the sub-committee will be glad to answer concerning the suitability of any suggested donations. Checks may be drawn, and books forwarded to Professor Frederick J. E. Woodbridge, Columbia University, New York City, New York.

A. C. ARMSTRONG, *Chairman*,
FREDERICK J. E. WOODBRIDGE,
MORRIS R. COHEN.

To the Editors of the JOURNAL OF PHILOSOPHY:

In the interest of the freedom of discussion so essential to philosophy, I wish to protest most respectfully against the position of Dr. Parkhurst's animadversions on the paper I read before the American Philosophical Association. To question the evidence for that which is generally taken for granted is surely one of the functions of a philosopher, and this I tried to do to the best of my ability in reference to the popular belief in universal evolution, in the sub-conscious mind, and in induction as the essence of scientific method (I was very careful to discriminate, as Dr. Parkhurst does not, between universal evolution and Darwinian natural selection). If my questionings are based on ignorance or misapprehension, Dr. Parkhurst and other friends of these doctrines can readily correct me and thus render a great service to science by guarding others against similar errors. But to ignore my actual arguments and to deplore them "chiefly for the improper use to which they might be put" by obscurantists in Kentucky or in a New York newspaper, seems to me to introduce or revive a most unwarranted and dangerous restraint on the freedom of philosophic discussion. Surely the danger from misuse by temporarily popular obscurantists (and what utterance of man is guaranteed against such misuse?) is much less serious than the danger from philosophers suppressing their opinions, even before their colleagues, lest obscurantists misuse such expression. Would not such a policy be itself literally the veriest obscurantism?

Similarly, because philosophy has nothing to gain by introducing into its discussions the passionate intolerances of the marketplace, it seems to me unfortunate to have philosophic papers characterized in moral terms such as "cynical," *etc.* In view of the uncontradicted

agreement (expressed by Prof. Pratt) which my paper received at its reading, a reasonable respect for our fellow-philosophers' power to express their dissent makes it doubtful whether many besides Dr. Parkhurst felt a disapproval so intense that "nothing short of a pitched battle would have promised satisfaction." But in any case the interest of philosophic clarity would have been better served by refuting rather than merely condemning my contentions.

Finally, Dr. Parkhurst sets up the authority of Prof. Bateson. Bateson is undoubtedly a great authority on biologic variation, but not on philosophic discussion. In any case I may retort that it is possible to have faith in experimental science and have little use for the concept of evolution—witness the work of our leading experimental biologist, Jacques Loeb, whose condemnation of the scientific use of the concept of evolution is much more drastic than anything I ventured to say. I might similarly cite the position of our leading anthropologist, Professor Boas, with reference to social evolution.

It is too bad that we live in a world in which the advanced scientific thought of sixty years ago has not yet penetrated to some of the multitude. But we must not suddenly become panicky on account of this, and limit our own freedom of thought and expression and prevent intellectual progress. Whatever the Mosaic cosmology may be to the multitude, it is undoubtedly a myth to most philosophers. But the refusal of philosophers to recognize the mythical character of popular doctrine of universal evolution, has led to unjustifiable dogmatism by dulling the critical edge of the sense for evidence. Dr. Parkhurst may call this view skepticism or even obscurantism, but I see no reason for making it esoteric.

Respectfully yours,

MORRIS R. COHEN

The New York Branch of the American Psychological Association met on Monday, April 24, in Schermerhorn Hall, Columbia University. The following papers were read:

Dr. F. Lyman Wells: *A Method of Memory Examination adapted to Psychotic Cases.*

Dr. Beardsley Ruml: *Notes on Applied Psychology.*

Dr. Clara F. Chassell: *A Test of Ability to Weigh Foreseen Social Consequences.*

A meeting of the Aristotelian Society was held on March 20, 1922, Professor G. Dawes Hicks in the Chair. Professor R. F. A. Hoernlé read a paper on "Some Byways of the Theory of Knowledge," a synopsis of which follows:

In the attempt to give scientific precision to their language, some philosophers have introduced into the theory of knowledge a new distinction, *viz.*, the distinction between *first-hand* knowledge and *second-hand* knowledge (or knowledge mediated by symbols), alongside of the current distinctions between "knowledge by acquaintance" and "knowledge by description," or "immediate acquaintance" and "thought." Acquaintance and immediate of language and of analysis, whereas first-hand knowledge (*e.g.*, that experience are, in current theory, commonly characterized by absence of a botanist engaged in research) may involve any amount of analysis and symbols of all sorts. Yet there will be no divorce of description from acquaintance, or of thought from immediate data, but the data will be ordered and will acquire significance, and their meaning will come to the investigator as fulfilled and realized in a sense in which it can not do to one who merely reads his account at second-hand. The choice of terminology is no mere matter of words, for it is a choice of meanings, and therefore of the qualities and relations which we affirm as "true" and "real" of the object under discussion. Definition does not help, for it leaves open the question whether anything bearing the character defined exists. The suggestion was made that a comparative and systematic study of philosophical languages is much to be desired, as a preliminary to rational choice, and, in any case, as a help to better mutual understanding.